DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 842 TM 011 220

TITLE	Chapter 2 Discretionary, 1984-85 Final Technical Report. Publication No. 84.63.
INSTITUTION	Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 Jun 85
NOTE	89p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Relations; Desegregation Methods; Dropout Prevention; Educational Improvement; *Federal Aid; *Financial Support; Grade 1; Outdoor Education; Primary Education; Reality Therapy; School Desegregation
IDENTIFIERS	*Austin Independent School District TX; *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 2

ABSTRACT

Under Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, local school district funds are supplemented in basic skills development, educational improvement and support services, and special programs. For the 1984-85 year, in the Austin (Texas) Independent School District, some of the Chapter 2 discretionary funds were allocated to four desegregation-related programs: (1) bus monitors; (2) extracurricular transportation; (3) instructional monitors for a reality therapy program for referred students; and (4) a school-community liaison project. Other programs funded with this money were: (1) a dropout prevention program; (2) an outdoor learning program; (3) Project Wilderness for the emotionally disturbed; (4) Project PLUS for underachieving first graders; (5) Spanish instruction for teachers and staff; and (6) Project Achieve, a reading specialist program. Eleven appendices, which comprise three-quarters of the document, describe each program in detail. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

1984-85 Final Technical Report

June 30, 1985

ED292842

TM 011 220

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Holley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Evaluation Associate:
Douglas Butler, M.S. Ed.

Evaluation Associate:
Leslie Lanham, M.S.W.

Senior Evaluator:
Jonathan J. Curtis, Ph.D.

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

1984-85 Final Technical Report

June 30, 1985

Publication No. 84.63

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND DISCLAIMER

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

84.63

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Final Report iii

Appendix A CENTRAL COUNCIL HOLDING POWER/DROPOUT PREVENTION A-1

Appendix B OUTDOOR LEARNING: Teacher Survey B-1

Appendix C OUTDOOR LEARNING: Coordinator Interview C-1

Appendix D PROJECT WILDERNESS: Teacher Ratings D-1

Appendix E PROJECT WILDERNESS: Student Survey E-1

Appendix F PROJECT PLUS: Principal/Teacher Interview F-1

Appendix G PROJECT PLUS: Teacher Survey G-1

Appendix H PROJECT PLUS: Parent Survey H-1

Appendix I SPANISH ACADEMY: Attendance Log and Job Titles I-1

Appendix J SPANISH ACADEMY: Course Evaluation J-1

Appendix K PROJECT ACHIEVE: Principal/Teacher Evaluation K-1

Chapter 2 Discretionary
Chapter 2 Formula

1985 Final Report

84.03

WHAT IS CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY?

WHAT IS CHAPTER 2 FORMULA?

In 1981 Congress consolidated several education laws into one act, the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA). The bulk of the consolidation was contained in Chapter 2 of ECIA. The **purpose of Chapter 2 is to supplement local district funds in three areas--basic skills development, educational improvement and support services, and special programs.** A state receives Chapter 2 funds based on it population of school-aged children and allocates at least 80% of these funds to local school districts. These **funds are allocated by formula, and thus are referred to as Chapter 2 Formula** funds. The districts receive an initial allocation based on student enrollment. A supplementary sum is also allocated based on the number of students whose education imposes a higher than average per-pupil cost on the district. Under the Texas formula, districts earn the supplement based on how many low-income students, neglected and/or delinquent children, students of limited English proficiency, and handicapped students they have. Altogether, the Austin Independent School District received $437,159 in Chapter 2 Formula funds for the 1984-85 school year. The **remaining 20% of the Chapter 2 funds are termed discretionary** funds and may be spent, within certain guidelines, in whatever way the state education agency decides. Texas' Chapter 2 Discretionary funds were set aside for aid to school districts which had received funds in 1981-82 through the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) to aid in the implementation of desegregation plans. The Austin Independent School District received $421,065 in Chapter 2 Discretionary funds for the 1984-85 school year.

84.03

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY/CHAPTER 2 FORMULA: 1984-85 FINAL REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AUTHORS: Leslie Lanham, Lauren Hall Moede

OTHER CONTACT PERSONS: Jonathan Curtis, Douglas Butler

MAJOR POSITIVE FINDINGS

1. Suspensions and incidences of corporal punishment at the three Project ASSIST elementary schools were reduced substantially from last year's totals.

2. Both parents and teachers of children receiving Project PLUS services noted improvements in academic skills and attitude toward learning. Teachers reported that reading levels and attendance also increased for these students.

3. Spanish Academy classes were well attended by AISD staff, and participants feel that the program has helped them both generally and with their jobs.

4. Teachers whose classes participated in the Outdoor Learning Program agreed that the study trips complement the science and social studies curriculum and provide students with an opportunity to develop social interaction skills.

5. Campus coordinators of the Extracurricular Transportation Program were satisfied with the procedures they used to inform the Transportation Department of their extracurricular transportation needs.

MAJOR FINDINGS REQUIRING ACTION

1. Of the 23 part-time bus monitor positions funded by Chapter 2 Formula, only 16 were filled at the time of the Bus Monitor Survey.

2. Over half of the teachers and one-fourth of the principals in schools served by Project Achieve responded "don't know/not applicable" to questions about the effectiveness of the program. Less than one-fourth of the teachers agreed that the project was effective. These findings are important because those teachers represented the recipients of the services.

3. Almost half (44%) of the teachers in schools served by bus monitors are unfamiliar with the service.

CHAPTER 2 FORMULA

During the 1984-85 school year, the Austin Independent School District allocated its Chapter 2 Formula funds to four desegregation-related programs and services. The four activities receiving funds were:

- Bus Monitors,
- Extracurricular Transportation,
- Project ASSIST Instructional Monitors, and
- School-Community Liaison Program.

The findings obtained from the evaluation activities conducted for each program will be discussed below. A detailed description of the evaluation procedures is presented in the Chapter 2 Formula: 1984-85 Technical Report, ORE publication number 84.19.

BUS MONITOR PROGRAM

WHAT IS THE BUS MONITOR PROGRAM?

The Bus Monitor Program provides part-time monitors who assist students and bus drivers on routes to and from the following paired elementary schools with grades 1-3:

- Bryker Woods
- Govalle
- Metz
- Norman
- Oak Springs
- Sanchez
- Sims
- Sunset Valley
- Wooten

During the 1984-85 school year, the Transportation Department had 12 half-time and 11 three-quarter time bus monitors funded by Chapter 2 Formula.

WHAT DOES A BUS MONITOR DO?

The Office of Research and Evaluation developed a Bus Monitor Survey to answer this question and others associated with the Bus Monitor Program. Although Chapter 2 Formula funds were allocated to pay for the salaries of 23 bus monitors, only 16 positions were filled at the time of the survey.

When asked, "What do you do?", the 12 monitors returning the survey reported that they performed the following activities most frequently:

- Make sure students are seated properly,
- Keep students' limbs within the bus,
- Count students before the bus leaves school,
- Enforce riding rules, and
- Help students cross the street.

When asked "How do you maintain discipline on the bus?", the monitors reported performing the following activities regularly:

- Keep noise level down,
- Report discipline problems to the principal,
- Explain the rules to the students, and
- Report discipline problems to the student's teacher.

HOW IMPORTANT ARE BUS MONITORS TO PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS?

When principals were surveyed about the bus monitors serving their schools, the majority (80%) agreed that monitors met the needs of the students attending their schools. An equal number (80%) agreed that bus monitors were an essential part of the bussing effort, without which some parents would withdraw their child(ren) from AISD. Although half of the principals reported a reduction in the number of bus monitors serving their schools, most of them (80%) were able to maintain safety and discipline on the bus without making any changes in the way they supervised the busses their students rode.

Teachers in the schools served by bus monitors were also surveyed about the Bus Monitor Program. When asked how familiar they were with the Bus Monitor service, less than a quarter (21.5%) of the teachers reported they were familiar with the service. This lack of familiarity was reflected in the responses to the second question asked of the teachers, which dealt with their satisfaction with the level of service provided by bus monitors. Over two-thirds (70%) of the Teachers surveyed responded neutrally (neither satisfied nor unsatisfied) to this item.

EXTRACURRICULAR TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

WHAT IS EXTRACURRICULAR TRANSPORTATION?

The Extracurricular Transportation Program is a service provided by the AISD Transportation Department to 18 junior and senior high schools. Its purpose is to provide transportation to students who have been reassigned due to the District's desegregation plan and who participate in extracurricular activities. Transportation was provided to and from activities at the following senior high schools: Anderson, Austin, Crockett, Johnston, Lanier, McCallum, Reagan, and Travis. This service was also provided to the following junior high schools: Burnet, Bedichek, Dobie, Fulmore, Lamar, Martin, Murchison, Porter , and O. Henry.

HOW DOES THE EXTRACURRICULAR TRANSPORTATION SERVICE OPERATE?

The campus coordinators of the Extracurricular Transportation Program were surveyed to determine how the service operates at each school. Almost all (94%) of the campus coordinators reported having an afternoon athletic bus that transported students home following practice. The option of morning athletic busses was never utilized. Afternoon activity busses were used by almost half (44%) of the schools, while morning activity busses were less utilized (22%).

HOW CAN THE EXTRACURRICULAR TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM BE IMPROVED?

The survey of campus coordinators and the Districtwide survey of administrators asked for suggestions for improving the Extracurricular Transportation Program. The following improvements were suggested:

- Provide smaller busses,
- Consolidate routes,
- Improve driver capabilities,
- Improve scheduling, and
- Expand service to include more students.

PROJECT ASSIST

WHAT IS PROJECT ASSIST?

Project ASSIST (Assisting Special Students in Stress Times) was implemented during the 1983-84 school year at three elementary schools--Blanton, Walnut Creek, and Wooldridge. It is based on an approach to discipline called reality therapy, which stresses the importance of teaching students to accept responsibility for their own behavior, in contrast to punishment which controls behavior by fear or threats. Teachers were trained in the use of reality therapy and three instructional monitors were hired to supervise the ASSIST room, an in-school suspension room for misbehaving students.

HOW DID TEACHERS USE REALITY THERAPY IN THEIR CLASSROOMS?

A sample of teachers from each of the three schools was interviewed to see how they had used reality therapy in their classrooms. All of the teachers indicated they were using reality therapy primarily for severe offenses. Either oral or written plans were made by the misbehaving students in which they made a commitment to change their behavior. Oral plans were usually made for less severe types of misbehavior. In cases of repeat offenses or severe instances of misbehavior, a student was referred to the principal, who determined if the student would be placed in the ASSIST room for an in-school suspension.

WHO WAS REFERRED TO THE ASSIST ROOM?

The instructional monitors kept logs on which they recorded information on the students referred to the ASSIST room. Information such as the grade, sex, and ethnicity of the incoming students was recorded. In general, more males than females and more Blacks than Anglos or Hispanics were referred to the ASSIST room.

HOW LONG DID STUDENTS STAY IN THE ASSIST ROOM?

Students were referred to the ASSIST room for periods of time ranging from one hour to eighteen hours or more. Walnut Creek had the largest percentage (88.9%) of short-term referrals (0-6 hours); Blanton also had a large number (59.4%) of students referred to the ASSIST room for one day or less. At Wooldridge the length of referrals was more equally distributed among the range of 1-18 hours. At Blanton and Walnut Creek only a small number of the referrals spent more than two days in the ASSIST room.

HOW OFTEN WERE STUDENTS REFERRED TO THE ASSIST ROOM?

At all three Project ASSIST schools, the majority of the referred students were assigned to the ASSIST room 1-3 times. Blanton had more multiple offenders than the other two schools, judged by the highest percentage (33.5%) of students in the 4-6, 7-9, 10 or more referrals categories. At Walnut Creek 26.5% and at Wooldridge 8.4% of the referred students were assigned to the ASSIST room more than three times. Wooldridge had the lowest percentage of multiple offenders, but the largest percentage of students referred to the ASSIST room for two or more days, which may indicate that for these students, the consequence of working for several days in isolation was sufficient to deter them from misbehaving.

WHY WERE STUDENTS REFERRED TO THE ASSIST ROOM?

The majority of the students at each of the three schools were referred to the ASSIST room for hitting or striking another student or for disobeying or abusing a teacher. A large number of students were also referred for disrupting class. Other offenses that resulted in a referral to the ASSIST room include the following: Truancy, using profanity, excessive tardiness, carrying a weapon, and stealing.

HOW DID PROJECT ASSIST EFFECT THE NUMBER OF SUSPENSIONS AND INCIDENCE OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT?

During the 1983-84 school year, which was the first year of Project ASSIST, the number of out-of-school suspensions was reduced by more than one-half for all students at Walnut Creek (from 59 to 12) and Wooldridge (from 55 to 21). At Blanton, the number rose in 1983-84, but this increase was accounted for by suspensions given to Special Education students, of whom Blanton had a larger number in 1983-84. Because of a change in the way suspensions are categorized, direct comparisons cannot be made between the 1984-85 school year and previous years. However, the total number of suspensions and the number of days missed due to suspensions are substantially lower than in the previous two years.

A comparison of the number of students at the three Project ASSIST schools receiving corporal punishment shows a decrease in the incidences of corporal punishment for both Special Education students and non-Special Education students from the 1982-83 school year (before Project ASSIST) until the 1984-85 school year (the second year of Project ASSIST). The incidence of corporal punishment has decreased at all Project ASSIST schools, from a total of 77 incidences in 1982-83, to 22 incidences in 1983-84, to three incidences during the 1984-85 school year.

This information indicates that Project ASSIST provided a viable alternative for dealing with discipline problems, thus reducing the schools' dependence on the disciplinary actions of out-of-school suspensions and corporal punishment.

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY LIAISON PROGRAM

WHAT IS THE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY LIAISON PROGRAM?

The School-Community Liaison program provides human-relations problem resolution, assistance to students identified as potential dropouts, crisis intervention, school-community support services, and student activity support to AISD schools most impacted by desegregation. General assistance is also given to parents during conference periods and home visits, thus providing a link between the school and home.

WHAT ACTIVITIES WERE FUNDED WITH CHAPTER 2 FORMULA MONIES?

The School-Community Liaison Program used its Chapter 2 Formula funds in three areas:

- Transportation,
- Reproduction, and
- Multicultural activities.

Transportation was provided to parents and students impacted by the District's desegregation process to attend activities such as school orientations, Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings, and cultural activities. Busses were also provided to transport students to human-relations workshops, field trips, school dances, and choir concerts.

Chapter 2 Formula funds were also used to pay for the reproduction of school newsletters and other publications used to increase parent contact. Funds were used to reproduce the following publications:

- Ortega Elementary's school newsletter,
- Zavala Elementary's school newsletter (English and Spanish versions),
- Black Heritage Calendar, and
- Diez y Seis de Septiembre flyers.

Several multicultural activities received Chapter 2 Formula funds for facility rentals. Two facilities were rented for human-relations workshops. Additionally, transportation to these workshops was paid for with Chapter 2 Formula funds.

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

The Austin Independent School District allocated Chapter 2 Discretionary funds to six desegregation-related programs during the 1984-85 school year. These programs were:

- Central Council Holding Power/Dropout Prevention,
- Outdoor Learning Program,
- Project Wilderness,
- Project PLUS,
- Spanish Academy, and
- Project Achieve.

This report will describe each program and present findings obtained from the evalulation activities conducted by the Office of Research and Evaluation. A detailed description of the evaluation procedures is provided in the Chapter 2 Discretionary: 1984-85 Technical Report, ORE publication number 84.63.

CENTRAL COUNCIL HOLDING POWER/DROPOUT PREVENTION

WHAT IS THE CENTRAL COUNCIL HOLDING POWER/DROPOUT PREVENTION?

From age 14 to the time of graduation, one in four students drops out of school. The 1983-84 Chapter 2 Discretionary grant funded a Dropout Prevention Task Force to develop a districtwide plan to address this problem. The Central Council was appointed for the 1984-85 school year to help implement the comprehensive plan. It included members of the 1983-84 Task Force and represented all facets of the District as well as the community. The responsibilities of the Council were to:

- Review proposals for future programs to determine their compatibility with the comprehensive plan,
- Serve as a resource for schools,
- Monitor progress on the dropout prevention plan, and
- Improve coordination between AISD and the community.

WHAT WERE THE ACTIVITIES OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL?

The 1984-85 Council developed an Alternative Education Center for students who have been suspended. Students attend this center rather than staying home during their suspension. The Council also implemented a night high school for dropouts who work full-time but desire a regular high school diploma. Finally, council members shared information on the needs of AISD students and available community services in an effort to improve coordination between the District and the community.

OUTDOOR LEARNING PROGRAM

WHAT IS THE OUTDOOR LEARNING PROGRAM?

The Outdoor Learning Program organized and funded study trips to several sites in the Austin area (McKinney Falls State Park, Wild Basin, Mayfield Park, The Natural Science Center) for elementary students enrolled in ethnically paired schools. The study trips had two main goals. The first was to reinforce concepts and ideas taught in the classroom in an alternative setting. The second goal was to develop the social-interaction skills of students from different cultural backgrounds. The trips included group activities to promote peer interaction. Two hundred ten classes participated in Outdoor Learning activities. In addition to the study trips, the program also provided Outdoor Camping experiences for 240 sixth graders. The goals of these trips were to increase students' understanding of and appreciation for the environment and to provide opportunities for positive, multicultural interaction.

WERE THE GOALS OF THE OUTDOOR LEARNING PROGRAM MET?

Participating teachers were surveyed by the Office of Research and Evaluation to gain their opinion on the success of the program. The results of the survey were:

- Ninety-nine percent of the teachers felt that the study trip activities complemented the science or social studies unit,
- Almost all agreed that the level of instruction was appropriate, and
- Ninety-seven percent of the teachers indicated that the activities were conducive to the development of social-interactional skills.

Outstanding features cited by the teachers were:

- Good program organization,
- Integration of science and social studies,
- Small group orientation,
- Planning of activities to maintain student interest, and
- The opportunity to become familiar with Austin's facilities.

PROJECT WILDERNESS

WHAT IS PROJECT WILDERNESS?

Project Wilderness provided outdoor, physical games and activities for emotionally disturbed students in self-contained classes at four elementary schools. The goal of the program is to build self-confidence and teach cooperation, problem-solving, and risk-taking. Thirty-six students spent approximately eight hours a month participating in activities such as hiking, caving, rock climbing, and rappelling. The average attendance for each session was 5.5.

Project Wilderness staff also worked with junior high classes in Special Education, Bilingual Transitional, ESL, and PAL. These groups were one day to three weeks in duration.

WHAT IMPACT DID THE PROGRAM HAVE?

Both students and teachers were surveyed at the beginning and at the end of the program to get information on the impact of Project Wilderness. Students were asked to rate themselves on items reflecting their obedience, motivation, and social ease. Teachers were asked only to rate students on obedience and motivation.

A paired t-test procedure using SAS was performed on the pre- and posttest scores. The results from the paired t-test on teacher ratings are shown below and reveal that teachers rated Project Wilderness participants significantly higher on both obedience and motivation at the end of the program.

Variable	N	Mean	Mean Gain	SE	T	P
Obedience						
Pre	24	25.6	1.7	0.8	2.08	.049
Post	24	27.3				
Motivation						
Pre	21	25.2	2.2	0.6	3.54	.002
Post	21	27.4				

Figure 1: T-TEST COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POSTTEST TEACHER RATINGS OF STUDENT OBEDIENCE AND MOTIVATION.

Unlike their teachers, students did not perceive themselves as making gains in any area. However, this finding should be interpreted with caution, as there were indications that some students either did not understand the questionnaire or were behaving uncooperatively that particular day. This suggests the need to develop a more objective measurement of the impact of Project Wilderness. Particularly if the program continues to serve emotionally disturbed students, a self-rating approach will yield questionable results.

PROJECT PLUS

WHAT IS PROJECT PLUS?

Project PLUS (Progress and Learning for Underachieving Students) provided early intervention for first graders who were at risk of having difficulty with the regular first grade curriculum. The goal of the program was to help these students to achieve and experience success, and thus, improve their self-concept and attitudes toward learning and school. Thirty-seven children from two elementary schools received small group instruction in math and reading.

HOW WERE STUDENTS SELECTED FOR PROJECT PLUS?

Student selection at both schools, Govalle and Sunset Valley, was based on spring ITBS scores, performance on the Metropolitan Readiness Test, and teacher assessment.

WHAT WERE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHILDREN SELECTED?

The characteristics of the children served by Project PLUS during the 1984-85 school year are outlined below:

School	Ethnicity				Sex	
	Anglo	Black	Hispanic	Other	Boys	Girls
Sunset Valley	3	13	3	0	8	11
Govalle	2	9	6	1	10	8

HOW WAS THE PROGRAM IMPLEMENTED?

Children in both schools were taught in a regular classroom but worked in small groups each day with the PLUS teacher. At Govalle each child spent 2 1/2 hours with the PLUS teacher, one hour on math and the remainder on reading. Group size ranged from four to ten. PLUS students at Sunset Valley worked with the PLUS teacher one hour a day, thirty minutes on math and thirty on reading. Three to six children were grouped together but received individual attention as needed. The children in the PLUS program at both schools were dispersed throughout the first grade classes.

IN WHAT WAYS WAS THE PLUS PROGRAM SUCCESSFUL?

When principals and PLUS teachers were interviewed about the program, they emphasized both the self-concept and academic progress made by PLUS students. They reported that the individual attention and recognition gave students a feeling of being special, and the growth and change that occurred helped to improve their self-confidence. One interviewee stated that those children going on to the second grade would not have done so without the PLUS program.

Both parents and teachers of PLUS students were surveyed to aid in the assessment of the program's success. All of the parents stated that Project PLUS provided their child with extra help in math and reading, and one-half felt that their child would not have made progress without this help. Responses to open-ended questions indicate that parents have noted improvements in reading and math skills and increases in confidence and motivation.

Teachers, too, cited academic progress and improved self-concept for PLUS students. They reported that attendance increased and gains in reading level occurred.

SPANISH ACADEMY

WHAT IS THE SPANISH ACADEMY?

The Spanish Academy provided beginning, intermediate and advanced Spanish instruction to AISD staff during noncontract hours. Four teachers taught fourteen classes each semester. Classes met either once or twice a week for 12 weeks in the fall and 14 weeks in the spring.

WHO ATTENDED THE CLASSES AND HOW WELL WERE THEY ATTENDED?

Over half of those participating in the classes were teachers, but a wide diversity of occupations was represented. The average class size was 9.2, smaller than last year's 12.6. The average class attendance was 6.8, or 74%.

HOW SATISFIED WERE PARTICIPANTS WITH THE PROGRAM?

A course evaluation was conducted at the end of each semester in order to answer this question. Most respondents indicated that the course was well organized and well taught. They were satisfied with the pace, the materials, scheduling, location, class size, and duration. Ninety-six percent reported that the course had helped them in general, and 76% said it had helped them with their jobs. Participants felt that the course gave them the ability and confidence to try to communicate with their Spanish-speaking students and parents and that this effort was appreciated.

Seventy-nine percent answered that they plan to continue taking Spanish Academy courses. Although this number is high, it has decreased from 96% in 1983-84. However, responses to the other questions seem to rule out any significant dissatisfaction with the program. For those who indicated that they would not continue taking Spanish Academy classes, the major concern was lack of time. In general, participants were appreciative that the District provided such an opportunity for its staff.

PROJECT ACHIEVE

WHAT IS PROJECT ACHIEVE?

Project Achieve provided for a reading specialist at each secondary school to work with the Instructional Coordinator, Secondary Reading, in planning an effective reading program for that campus. The project was designed primarily for 8th and 9th grade students who had not mastered the Texas Assessment of Basic Skills (TABS) tests, administered annually statewide. Reading Specialists were responsible for team planning with language arts/reading teachers and for providing inservice training for campus content area teachers in order to raise the reading achievement test scores for all students.

WHAT WERE THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF PROJECT ACHIEVE?

The major goal of Project Achieve was to raise the reading achievement test scores of students at all levels of reading proficiency. Specific objectives were:

- To help students demonstrate competency on the TABS by scoring at least 85% on each of the Exit-Level Objectives in Reading,
- To offer inservice training at the local campus level to content field teachers, and
- To reduce the number of students who drop out of AISD.

WAS PROJECT ACHIEVE SUCCESSFUL?

The Office of Research and Evaluation conducted a districtwide survey of administrators and teachers which included questions about Project Achieve. The results show that while 5,109 students were served, over one-fourth of the administrators and **one-half of the teachers did not know about or did not utilize the program.** Further, **less than 25% of the teachers agreed that Project Achieve services were effective.** They responded either neutrally or negatively to questions about the adequacy of services and effectiveness of inservice training, mini-sessions in TABS skills, and recommended strategies for including TABS skills in the content areas. Thus, a majority of the potential clientele of Project Achieve (teachers) either were unaware of the program or did not find it effective.

It is possible that teachers may have received Project Achieve services without knowing the source of those services. This lack of visibility may be due to the newness of the program but remains a problem which should be addressed. Even more troubling is the small number of positive responses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Butler, D. CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY: 1984-85 evaluation design. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Pub. No. 84.16), Austin Independent School District, Fall 1984.

Butler, D. and Lannam, L. CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY: 1984-85 final technical report. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Pub. No. 84.63), Austin Independent School District, June 1985.

Ligon, G. 1984-85 EVALUATION PLANS. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Pub. No. 84.09), Austin Independent School District, Fall 1984.

Moede, L. CHAPTER 2 FORMULA: 1984-85 evaluation design. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Pub. No. 84.12), Austin Independent School District, November 1984.

Moede, L. CHAPTER 2 FORMULA: 1984-85 final technical report. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Pub. No. 84.19), Austin Independent School District, June 1985.

SYSTEMWIDE EVALUATION: 1984-85 final technical report. Austin, Texas: Office of Research and Evaluation (Pub. No. 84.20), Austin Independent School District, June 1985.

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

Dr. Glynn Ligon, Director

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Dr. David A. Doss, Assistant Director

Dr. Jonathan Curtis, Senior Evaluator

Douglas Butler, Chapter 2 Discretionary Evaluation Associate

Leslie Lanham, Chapter 2 Discretionary Evaluation Associate

Lauren Hall Moede, Chapter 2 Formula Evaluation Associate

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Larry G. Waterhouse, President

Abel R. Ruiz, Vice President

Bernice Hart, Secretary

Lidia M. Perez

Peter W. Werner, M.D.

Ed Small

Nan Clayton

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. John Ellis

Publication Number: 84.03

Cover Drawing by Laura Cleveland, Austin High School

84.63

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX A

CENTRAL COUNCIL HOLDING POWER/DROPOUT PREVENTION

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

CENTRAL COUNCIL HOLDING POWER/DROPOUT PREVENTION

PURPOSE

Results from the Dropout Council Program records and a coordinator interview were used to address the following decision and evaluation questions from the Chapter 2 Discretionary Evaluation Design for 1984-85.

Decision Question D3: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Dropout Council be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?

Evaluation Question D3-1: What were the characteristics of the Dropout Council Members?

Evaluation Question D3-2: Were there problems encountered in getting the council started? If so, what were the problems? How were the difficulties resolved?

Evaluation Question D3-3: What activities were engaged in by the council?

PROCEDURE

The evaluation associate collected program records in April and May, 1985. The Dropout Council Coordinator was interviewed and a Council meeting was attended by the evaluation associate in April, 1985.

RESULTS

The membership of the Central Council for holding Power/Dropout Reduction included both AISD staff and a broad selection of community organization representatives. Those groups participating were:

- Youth Network Council
- Capital City Chamber of Commerce
- City Council
- University of Texas
- Gray Panthers of Austin
- Big Sisters
- Big Brothers
- Austin Area Urban League
- Austin Chamber of Commerce
- Juvenile Court

- Health Services
- Austin Association of Teachers
- Mexican American Chamber of Commerce
- Howard, Medler, Tammer, and Bergendorf
- Teenage Parent Council of Austin
- Austin Child Guidance
- Private Industry Council
- Austin Independent School District:
  - Parents
  - Counselors
  - Principals
  - Special Education Coordinator
  - Elementary Coordinator
  - Academic Coordinator

Six Council members worked on the 1983-84 Dropout Prevention Task Force. The ethnic breakdown for the 1984-85 Council was:

Ethnicity	Number	Percentage
Anglo	15	57.7%
Black	6	23.1%
Hispanic	5	19.2%
TOTALS:	26	100.0%

Because it was a new program, the first task was to organize the Council. This step took some time, as members had to be selected from sixty recommendations. In addition, both the coordinator and the members spent time becoming oriented to the program and acquainted with the agencies represented. For these reasons, the Council did not begin their activities as early in the school year as they would have preferred. It is expected, however, that since the Council is now in place, this problem will not occur in the future.

The responsibilities of the council were to:

- Review proposals for future dropout prevention programs
- Serve as a resource for schools
- Monitor progress on dropout prevention plan
- Improve coordination between AISD and the community

During the 1984-85 school year the council focused on the last responsibility by making increased communication between AISD and human service organizations a major goal. Council members shared information on the needs of AISD students and services offered by the community. Plans for the future are to match services available with the needs of the students on each campus.

Other activities were carried out by the council. Both an alternative education center and a night high school were planned and implemented (See Attachment A-1). Campus Plan Summaries for dropout prevention have been prepared for elementary, junior high, and senior high levels. (See Attachment A-2). These list both existing programs and future efforts to address the dropout problem.

PRIORITY 7. DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAM

Goal: Continue efforts on the dropout prevention program, i.e., identification of possible alternative school facility and implementation of action items.

STATUS: Johnny Brown was approved by the Board on November 12, 1984 to be the administrator of the Alternative Center. Operation of the Center began the next day. School goals in the areas of student attendance, achievement, behavior, and holding power have been set. To date 32 students have attended the Alternate Center.

Martin Bera was approved by the Board on November 26, 1984, to be principal of the night high school. Operation began January 21, 1985, with salaries and fees as approved by the Board on January 14, 1985.

Key Staff Person: Billie Franke

Committee: A. Dropout Prevention Council
B. Campus Contact Group

Members: A. Claudia Tousek, Orphalinda Bazan, Ann Neely, Roberta Green, James Viramontes, Vivian Ward, James Wilson, David Freeman, Yolanda Rocha, David Cardosa, Richard Kouri, Donna Knapp, Dian Harrison, Louis DeMoll, Tom Viola, Grant Thomas, David Jacob, Karen Quebec, Wanda Brown, Robena Jackson, Karen Cook, Carroll Patterson (Three appointments pending-contact made; waiting for response.)
B. Appointments pending

Ultimate Objective: Implement specific recommendations from holding power study committee (i.e., alternative education center).

Target Date	Activities	Status as of 1/25/85
Nov. 1984	Review holding power plan with elementary and secondary principals	Completed
Nov. 1984	Gloria Williams: Present alternative center plans to Board for approval	Completed
Nov. 1984	Personnel: Name (with Board's approval) administrator for alternative education center (Johnny Brown, Nov. 12, 1984)	Completed
Nov. 1984	Implement alternative education center and night high school	Completed

Target Date	Board/Cabinet Actions and Decisions	Status as of 1/25/85
Nov. 1984	Approve night high school	Completed
Nov. 1984	Appoint night high school principal (Martin Bera, Nov. 26, 1984)	Completed
Jan. 1985	Dropout Prevention Council: Hold first meeting	Completed
Feb. 1985	Campus contact group: Hold first meeting	Scheduled

HOLDING POWER/DROPOUT REDUCTION
Campus Plan Summary
Elementary School

- Faculty awareness meeting
- Identify high-risk students
- Big Buddy-Little Buddy Pilot Project-pairing younger student with older student to improve self esteem and attention span in your students; patience and personal strengths are increased in older students
- Merit System-teachers give students merits for outstanding work weekly; students names are displayed in hallway weekly, a note is sent to parents
- Happy grams-happy face notes to students when they do something special
- Pal program
- Parenting classes for parents of students enrolled
- In-service teachers about Holding Power-Dropout Reduction
- Group and individual counseling
- Low student-teacher ratio especially K-3
- Outdoor camping for overnight experience
- Provide multi-cultural activities
- School-parent communication to foster positive self-image and self-direction in students
- Establish Student Advisory Council
- Develop and implement program for "gifted underachievers"
- School newsletter to spotlight positive school/student happenings
- Contract with parents to monitor a specified period of homework to improve student grades (contract attached)
- Super Citizen Program
- Peer Tutoring
- Adopt-A-Kid Program
- After school recreational activities (offered on regular schedule)

HOLDING POWER/DROPOUT REDUCTION
Campus Plan Summary
Elementary School

- Buddy program-monitoring attendance, students rewarded for consistant improvement
- Involve PTA in parent awareness/solutions activity
- Project BEST
- Problem Solvers program
- Junior Great Books program
- "Catch-A-Child Being Good" when child is caught 5 times, the child's name is displayed in hallway.
- ILAC (I am Lovable and Capable) helps students learn how to deal with personal crisis
- Lunch Bunch Stars-students selected to have lunch with principals in special area
- Reward good attendance
- School-wide VIP program-recognizes good citizenship
- "Most Improved" rewards
- Lunchroom Behavior Awards
- Invite former dropouts to discuss the problems they encountered because of quitting school
- Students required to learn name of all other students in homeroom/ classroom
- After school enrichment programs

HOLDING POWER/DROPOUT REDUCTION
Campus Plan Summary
Junior High School

- Identify high-risk students
- Identify counselor to target high-risk students
- Individual and small group counseling sessions
- Tutorial sessions are available for high-risk students
- Pass Club - students not doing well in classwork are identified and invited to participate during Advisory period each Friday (study skills are taught)
- Mentor program using Adopt-A-School sponsor
- Rap sessions with students in Detention Hall
- Work with feeder 6th grades to assure smooth transition to Junior High School
- Involvement of All campus staff to be "mentors" for high-risk students (1 to 1 involvement) Buddy Program
- Wilderness Challenge Project
- School assemblies to increase student awareness of why some dropout of school
- Get the kids to Summer School-intensive effort to get students into Summer School who have failed
- Neighborhood Meeting to increase parent awareness and involvement
- Parent/teacher conference
- Project PACE - provides remediation in Reading and English
- Academic/behavioral checklist-daily report to go to parents
- Student Orientation - classroom visitation to discuss campus rules, policies, behavior, coping skills
- Attendance incentives
- Club Fair to encourage student participation in extracurricular activities - end of year trip for "active" students
- Newcomers club for students new to AISD - provides emotional support for students
- Career Fair to increase students awareness before career choices are made
- PAL program
- Project BEST

HOLDING POWER/DROPOUT REDUCTION
Campus Plan Summary
High Schools

- Identify high-risk students
- One-to-one conference with students to get them to identify their problems affecting school work
- Identify counselor to work specifically with high-risk students
- Buddy system between National Honor Society and students with learning problems
- Adopt-A-Student: teacher-student paired to provide support and positive influence for high-risk students
- Provide incentives (i.e., movie passes, etc.) for students who achieve
- PAL program
- Encourage participation in Evening School to stay on grade level
- Provide students with Community Resource information
- Provide programs to give students good role models (assemblies)
- Recognize student achievement to increase self esteem
- Teacher awareness
- TESA participation (Teacher Expectations & Student Achievement)
- Emphasis on Vocational Education opportunities
- Tutoring for high-risk students
- Individual & small group counseling sessions
- Participation in Communities In Schools Demonstration Project
- Parent/teacher conferences
- Project BEST

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX B

OUTDOOR LEARNING PROGRAM SURVEY

84.63

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

OUTDOOR LEARNING PROGRAM SURVEY

PURPOSE

A survey was designed to address the following decision and evaluation questions.

Decision Question D4: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Outdoor Learning Program be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?

Evaluation Question D4-2: Did participating teachers find that the outdoor learning experience was related to developing social interaction skills?

PROCEDURE

Description of the Instrument: The Outdoor Learning Program Survey was designed to collect information from participating teachers on various aspects associated with the study trips of the Outdoor Learning Program (Attachment B-1). The survey consisted of identification information, six objective response items, and two open-ended questions.

Identification Information: The following information uniquely identified each survey:

- o A number in the upper right corner identifying the teacher
- o Site visited
- o Grade taught
- o School code

Objective Response Items: The second part of the survey consisted of six statements associated with an aspect of the study trips.

Respondents were instructed to circle the alternative that best represented their degree of "agreement" or "disagreement" with each of the six statements presented using the following scale:

- o strongly agree
- o agree
- o disagree
- o strongly disagree
- o don't know/no opinion

In addition, space was provided in each item for accompanying comments.

Open-Ended Questions: The last part of the survey was two open-ended questions. The first asked respondents to identify the outstanding features of the study trip. The second asked respondents to make suggestions for improvements.

Identification of the Target Population: The target population for this survey consisted of the elementary school teachers who participated in the study trips organized by the Outdoor Learning Program during the fall and spring semesters of the 1984-85 school year.

Distribution of the Survey Forms: For those teachers whose study trip was scheduled for the fall semester, a survey form was mailed with an accompanying memo in October, 1984. The teachers were instructed to return a completed questionnaire after their participation in the study trip. In early December, 1984, a second questionnaire and a reminder memo were sent to those who had not yet returned their first questionnaire. With these efforts, 81 out of the 98 teachers contacted returned a completed questionnaire, resulting in an 83% response rate.

In mid-March, 1985, the same procedure described above was begun for the spring semester Outdoor Learning Program teacher participants. A second memo and questionnaire were sent in early May,1985 to those teachers whose study trip had already occurred but who had not returned a questionnaire. Seventy-three out of 112 teachers, or 65%, responded to the spring survey.

RESULTS

Of the 210 teachers whose classes participated in the Outdoor Learning Program during the 1984-85 school year, 154, or 73% returned a completed questionnaire. Figure 1 shows that all six grade levels were represented in the Outdoor Learning Program Survey, with the numbers decreasing in the higher levels.

GRADE	NUMBER OF TEACHERS RESPONDING TO SURVEY	PERCENTAGE
1	39	25
2	33	21
3	23	15
4	22	14
5	22	14
6	15	10
Totals	154	99

Note: The total percentage does not equal 100 due to rounding.

Figure B-1: FREQUENCIES BY GRADE AND TEACHER RESPONSES

Results of the distribution of responses by item are presented in Figure B-2 below.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DON'T KNOW NO OPINION OR BLANK
1. The activities of the study trip complemented science or social studies units for my grade level.	104 (68%)	47 (31%)	1 (1%)	0 (0)	2 (1%)
2. Teachers/Guides at the site were well prepared.	101 (66%)	50 (33%)	3 (2%)	0 (0)	0 (0)
3. Level of instruction at the site was appropriate to the students' needs.	107 (70%)	46 (30%)	1 (1%)	0 (0)	0 (0)
4. Activities during the study trip allowed students to develop social interactional skills	90 (58%)	60 (39%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)
5. Activities at the site were interesting to students.	122 (79%)	32 (21%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
6. With the exception of one study trip site (McKinney Falls) Chapter 2 pays from $1.50 to $2.00 per child for facilitity use and personnel. In your opinion, these fees are worth it.	102 (66%)	38 (25%)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	11 (7%)

Note: N=154. In some cases percentages do not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Figure B-2. RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON THE OUTDOOR LEARNING SURVEY

The majority of the respondents strongly agreed with each item; virtually no teachers disagreed with any item. The only item with a significant number of respondents choosing not to express an opinion was in regard to the payment of fees by Chapter 2. However, even on that question, 91% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed. Accompanying comments for each item are included in Attachment B-2.

A review of the responses to the open-ended questions about the program's outstanding features and suggestions for change indicated that the study trip is an important experience which complements the science and social studies curriculum. In addition, instruction received at each site was seen as being appropriate to the students' needs.

The outstanding features of the study trip most often cited included:

- Good program organization
- Integration of science and social studies
- Small group orientation
- Planning of activities to maintain student interest
- The opportunity to become familiar with Austin's facilities

While there was agreement that the Outdoor Learning Program is useful and a good experience for students, some recommendations for improvement were made. Suggestions included:

- Require the Outdoor Learning Kit for preparation curriculum
- Allow students more time for questions
- Arrange smaller groups to facilitate learning

A listing of all responses regarding outstanding features of the program and recommendations for improvement follow in Attachment B-3.

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

OUTDOOR LEARNING/CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

We hope that you enjoyed your scheduled Outdoor Learning study trip. In order to evaluate this program, we are asking you to fill out the following form. We appreciate your interest in the program.

Teacher: _____ Site: _____ Grade: _____ School Code: _____

Please circle the statement that best represents your degree of agreement/disagreement with the opinions presented.

1. The activities of the study trip complemented science or social studies units for my grade level.

   Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know/No Opinion

   Comment (if you wish):

2. Teachers/Guides at the site were well prepared.

   Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know/No Opinion

   Comment (if you wish):

3. Level of instruction at the site was appropriate to the student's need.

   Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know/No Opinion

   Comment (if you wish):

4. Activities during the study trip allowed students to develop social-interaction skills.

   Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know/No Opinion

   Comment (if you wish):

5. Activities at the site were interesting to students.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know/No Opinion

Comment (if you wish):

6. With the exception of one study trip site (McKinney Falls) Chapter 2 pays from $1.50 to $2.00 per child for facility use and personnel. In your opinion, these fees are worth it.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know/No Opinion

Comment (if you wish):

7. What was the outstanding feature of the study trip? _____

_____

_____

8. What would you change if you were to repeat this study trip? _____

_____

_____

Return forms to: Douglas M. Butler, O.R.E., Box 79

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

OUTDOOR LEARNING PROGRAM

Item 1. The activities of the study trip complemented science or social studies units for my grade level.

- This trip added to several of our units. It made our studies seem more real!!
- Crowe's Nest is barely satisfactory, but that is all we have available in Austin. So, if you want to see animals, that's the only place we can go.
- We do activities to complement both our old and new unit and seasons.
- We can tie in three of our social studies units to this trip.
- Examine/classify skills in science observation, collecting.
- The Outdoor Learning Unit provides good ideas; I would like to see well-developed units for these areas.
- I was not teaching a particular science unit at the time.
- Absolutely.
- The hands-on experiences were excellent modes of learning.
- It was a great follow-up enrichment program for our unit on birds.
- Great!
- Outstanding Birds of Prey Unit review for all students.

Item 2. Teachers/Guides at the site were well prepared.

- Every year there has been a different docent, and each one has brought something unique to the lesson.
- Best ever!
- Good preparation.
- Is always well prepared and takes all the necessary steps to prepare the teachers and students.
- The guides seemed to know all the names of plants and helped children to find animal evidence and fossils.

Item 2. Continued

- Pre-planning was done with coordinator of program-excellent presentation.
- I have had extremely well prepared guides in the past. The last 2 years our guides were UT students. They made major obvious errors in the identification of plants, animals, and fossils.
- Only one volunteer was at the site by the time we arrived. The bus was an hour late.
- The guides were enthusiastic and positive.
- We were first group of the season on Birds of Prey and I believe two of the teacher guides were first-time. Were fuzzy on directions given.
- And well organized.
- Were well prepared and on our level!
- In one group, the guides did not monitor the students' activities.
- Is an excellant planner, communicates well with children.

Item 3. Level of instruction at the site was appropriate to the student's need.

- I would present the Nature Hunt differently for benefit of Bilingual students.
- These activities reach all levels of ability.
- Materials available for different activities and levels.
- Including for my monolingual Spanish speakers, she used vocabulary in Spanish to make them understand and feel good.
- The level was appropriate, but some information was incorrect.
- The map skill was a little hard.
- The guides and presenters were very well prepared.
- Good review for our low students at each activity! Exciting for our higher students.

Item 4. Activities during the study trip allowed students to develop social-interaction skills.

- We arrived early and the docent present was expert at handling the 50 kids in a fun, creative way.
- Low-level children could understand while high-level thinking was challenged by good questions.
- Games were very appropriate, very well organized.
- It rained on us while at Mayfield Park, and we had to go inside the office. The students were to do activities without talking. The students were excited about the activities and excited about the trip; being quiet was very hard for them to do. On days when it rains, couldn't the office workers make allowances for some 'good' and/or 'learning' noise?
- Yes, but the group was too large.
- The children are involved in many language and social development activities.
- Children shared findings with each other.
- The 'College Bowl Game' with its grouping strategies makes each student dependent on the total group.
- Good interaction with games that were planned and played.
- Very good games - and team work on question sessions!
- The parachute caused kids to get lots of dust in their eyes.
- The games were excellent in regard to stimulating this interaction.
- The children were told many times, "Listen to me. Do not talk." There was so much to get excited over.

Item 5. Activities at the site were interesting to students.

- It is a day the children remember for years to come!
- Students enjoyed the variety, freedom to explore and observe.
- Children were very excited and wanted to share everything.
- They talked about it on the bus back to school!
- The variety was very good.

Item 6. With the exception of one study trip site (McKinney Falls), Chapter 2 pays from $1.50 to $2.00 per child for facility use and personnel. In your opinion, these fees are worth it.

- This outstanding study trip continues to be a favorite with --.
- For Crowe's Nest, I don't think it is worth $2.00 per child because you also have to pay for buses, and that makes this study trip too expensive for what we get to see.
- Since I go to McKinney Falls, I don't know about the other sites, but if they are conducted in the same manner, they would be well worth the money.
- I think the outdoor learning program is great, especially for our city children.
- This year was great.
- I would hate to see it go any higher!

Item 7. What was the outstanding feature of the study trip?

- The touching and feeling of the animals.
- The ponds were very full and had much to investigate.
- The park study, nature hunt, and trail life were equally outstanding.
- Going on the nature trail.
- The nature trail/walk
- Trip on the trail - the docent was excellent with the children; small groups were very helpful.
- Nature walk
- The nature bingo and nature trail
- The water ponds
- Walking along the nature trail.
- Small groups given a chance to interact with surroundings, led by knowledgeable guides.
- Nature trail and games
- Peacocks, hike
- Specific things are pointed out which otherwise the children would walk by and not see them.
- The children were given the chance to participate in a game that was related to the Nature Walk and, during the walk, specific things were pointed out to the children.

Item 8. What would you change if you were to repeat this study trip?

- I would add more games.
- The nature hike is a bit long for tired and hungry first graders! Maybe we could shorten it a bit because it certainly is worthwhile.
- Nothing? Just insure that, first, every first grade gets to enjoy this trip each year!
- Nothing.
- Take a longer trail walk and shorten the pond study at this time of the year; not much can be seen.
- More docents.
- I would prepare (if possible) the children to be calm and observe. Field trips are exciting and should allow at some point for the excitement.
- Nothing, it was excellent.
- Talk more about pond life before going to pond.
- Nature Hunt-show students what they are looking for since Bilingual students do not know some of the vocabulary.
- The activities at the pond are getting better over the years.

84.63

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX C

OUTDOOR LEARNING COORDINATOR INTERVIEW

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

OUTDOOR LEARNING COORDINATOR INTERVIEW

Purpose

An interview was conducted with the Coordinator of the Outdoor Learning Program to address the following decision and evaluation questions:

Decision Question D4: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Outdoor Learning Program be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?

Evaluation Question D4-1: What are the features of the Outdoor Learning Program?

Procedure

The evaluation associate interviewed the Coordinator of the Outdoor Learning Program in April of 1985.

Results

The questions asked of the coordinator and a summary of her answers are presented below.

WHAT IS THE GOAL OF THE OUTDOOR LEARNING PROGRAM?

The Coordinator reported that the goal of the Outdoor Learning Program was to provide educationally sound learning experiences for students in ethnically paired elementary schools in settings other than the classroom. Further, the social interaction among children from different cultural backgrounds which took place during these learning experiences was an important part of the program.

HOW WERE THE SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS CHOSEN?

The Coordinator explained that each teacher in thirty-one elementary schools received a flyer on the program. For each grade level, no less than 30 teachers were chosen by lottery to participate in the study trip. An attempt was made to see that all schools were represented sometime during the school year.

HOW WAS THE PROGRAM STRUCTURED?

The Outdoor Learning Program organized study trips to several sites in the Austin area, including McKinney Falls State Park, Mayfield Park, Wild Basin, Shoal Creek, Crowe's Nest Farm, and the Natural Science Center. The target population was elementary students in grades 1 through 6 who were enrolled in paired schools in the District. Both transportation and any fee for the activity were provided by the Outdoor Learning Program.

The study trip at each site generally lasted about two hours. Group activities to promote peer interaction were provided some time during the program.

In addition to the study trips, Outdoor Camping experiences were provided for sixth graders from Webb, Graham, Blackshear, Zavala, Casis, and Walnut Creek. These students took overnight or 3 day trips to Camp Cullen, Camp Olympia, McKinney Falls State Park, the Lone Star Girl Scout Camp, the Leander Rehabilitation Camp, and the LBJ National Park. Goals of the Outdoor Camping Program were to increase students' understanding of and appreciation for the environment and to provide opportunities for positive, multicultural interaction. Activities such as exploring nature, studying astronomy, hiking, predicting the weather, studying pioneer lifestyles, riding horses, and studying energy uses are only a few of the many that the students experience through this program.

WHAT PROBLEMS WERE ENCOUNTERED IN IMPLEMENTING THE PROGRAM?

Inadequate funding was the only problem cited by the Coordinator. Only half of the target population can be served by the program at the current level of funding.

84.63

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX D

PROJECT WILDERNESS
TEACHER RATINGS

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

PROJECT WILDERNESS TEACHER RATINGS

Purpose

At the beginning and again at the end of the Project Wilderness Program, teachers responded to items regarding the obedience and motivation of their students who were participating in the Project. Their answers provided information relevant to the following decision and evaluation questions.

Decision Question D1: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Project Wilderness be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?

Evaluation Question D1-2: Were gains made by participants on any of the following as a result of their Project Wilderness experience?

a. Teacher perceptions of students' obedience
b. Teacher perception of students' academic motivation

Procedure

Within the first two weeks after the Project Wilderness Program began, a teacher was selected for each participating student. If a teacher had referred the student to the program, he or she was asked to complete the questionnaire. Otherwise, teachers were chosen randomly from students' course schedules. The rating forms were placed in the teachers' school mailboxes along with a cover letter and a return envelope. (Attachment D-1). During the last week of the Project Wilderness session, the same rating forms were placed in the same teachers' boxes with a cover letter explaining that these were the posttest. Complete data, with both pre- and posttest surveys were received for 24 out of 36 students, resulting in a response rate of 67%. For an additional 8 students, either a pre- or posttest was missing; those surveys were not used in the study.

Results

Analysis of the Rating Form

Items on the surveys completed by teachers were written to assess student obedience and motivation. Item numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 were designed to measure obedience, while item numbers 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 reflected the teacher's perception of student motivation. Teachers were asked to rate the students on 18 behaviors according to the frequency with which the student exhibited that behavior

in recent weeks. The response options for each item were: 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Some of the time, 4=Often, 5=Very often. Item numbers 2, 5, 6, 9, 14, and 15 were negatively worded such that "4" or "5" reflected disobedience or lack of motivation. These items were recoded to make them consistent with the others. The eight items related to obedience were then summed so that higher numbers reflected greater obedience. The same process was used for the motivation items.

For the 1984 final report a reliability analysis was done on this instrument to determine whether the items assigned to each scale (i.e., obedience and motivation) showed evidence of internal consistency. Four reliabilty analyses were run as shown below, using the SPSS subprogram "RELIABILITY", which provides an estimate of Cronbach's alpha.

Pretest		Posttest	
Obedience	Motivation	Obedience	Motivation
α.86 (N=68)	α.84 (N=68)	α.83 (N=68)	α.89 (N=68)

The high reliability estimates (.86, .84, .83, .89) indicate that the items assigned to both scales appear to be measuring the same construct. Thus, using the summed scores for each scale rather than individual item scores in evaluating posttest gains is justified.

Analysis of posttest gains

To assess whether teachers perceived students as being more motivated or obedient after participating in the Wilderness Challenge Project, a paired t-test procedure using SAS was performed on the pre and posttest scores. If there were missing data on either scale, the obedience or motivation data for that case were ignored.

The results from the paired t-tests shown in Figure D-1 below reveal that teachers rated students significantly higher on both obedience and motivation after their participation in the Wilderness Challege Program.

Mean gains in perception of obedience equaled 1.7 ($t=2.08$, $p \leq .049$). Teacher ratings of obedience, pre- and posttest, yielded a mean gain of 2.2 ($t=3.54$, $p \leq .002$).

Variable	N	Mean	Mean Gain	SE	T	P
Obedience						
Pre	24	25.6	1.7	0.8	2.08	.049
Post	24	27.3				
Motivation						
Pre	24	24.9	2.2	0.6	3.54	.002
Post	21	27.4				

Figure D-1: T-TEST COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POSTTEST TEACHER RATINGS OF STUDENT MOTIVATION AND OBEDIENCE

Teacher ratings of the behavior of students who participated in the 1984-85 Wilderness Challenge Program indicate that positive changes occurred in both obedience and motivation. Because there was no control

group, it is not possible to determine with certainty that other factors did not contribute to the gains made. Students did not rate themselves as making gains in obedience, motivation, or social ease (See Appendix E). However, the results of the second part of the questionnaire described in Appendix E show that most participants felt that the program had helped them. Thus, it is possible that the program did influence their behavior and attitude such that their teachers perceived them as being more motivated and more obedient.

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

Wilderness Challenge Project

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Class: _____ Student Name: _____

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the Wilderness Challenge Program is how the students who participate in the program are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms.

We would appreciate your help in rating the behaviors of the student listed above. Base your ratings on your experience with this student in recent weeks.

Instructions: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 5 for each behavior description.

	Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	Very Often
1. Student follows directions in class.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Student makes trouble in class.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Student comes to class on time.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Student is polite to teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Student disagrees with teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Student fights with other students in class.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Student obeys classroom or school rules.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Student volunteers answers in class.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Student bothers other students when they are working.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Student asks questions in class.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Student pays attention in class.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Student studies well for tests.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Student does homework on time.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Student gives up on hard assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Student goofs off during tests.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Student asks teacher for help.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Student takes part in class discussions.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Student initiates conversations with teacher out of class.	1	2	3	4	5

Return Copies to: Douglas M. Butler, Adm. Bldg., Box 79

84.63

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX E

PROJECT WILDERNESS STUDENT SURVEY

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

PROJECT WILDERNESS STUDENT SURVEY

Purpose

Students participating in the Wilderness Challenge programs completed self-report questionnaires at the beginning and end of the program. These questionnaires provided information relevant to the following decision and evaluation questions:

Decision Question D-1: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Project Wilderness be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?

Evaluation Question D1-2: Were there gains in participants' perceptions of themselves on any of the following three dimensions as a result of their Project Wilderness experience?

1. Obedience (in classroom)
2. Academic motivation
3. Social ease

Procedure

During the first week of the Project Wilderness program, students were asked by the instructors to complete a one-page, self-report questionnaire (Attachment E-1). They sealed their completed questionnaires in envelopes and were told that the questionnaires were confidential and would be sent directly to ORE. On the last meeting day of the program, the evaluation assistant administered the same self-report questionnaires along with an additional page asking for their reactions to the program (Attachment E-2). Fourteen out of thirty-six students completed both a pre- and posttest. Incomplete data which was not used was received on an additional 19 students. Thus, the responses of 39% of the Wilderness Challenge participants was used for the analysis.

Results

The 23 items on the student questionnaire were designed to assess student perceptions of their obedience, academic motivation, and social ease. Sixteen of the items, those measuring student perceptions of their obedience in class and their academic motivation, matched the items on the teacher rating form.

84.63

For the first 16 items, students were asked to indicate how often they engaged in that behavior. Their choices were: 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Some of The Time, 4=Often and 5=Very Often. For the last six items which represented social ease, students were asked to indicate how easy it was for them to do those things. The possible responses were 1=Very Easy, 2=Somewhat Easy, 3=Somewhat Hard, and 4=Very Hard. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 were summed to form an obedience score. Items 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 were used to determine a motivation score, and the last seven items on the student questionnaire were summed to represent a social ease score. All items that had been negatively worded such that a high number represented disobedience, lack of motivation, or social discomfort were recoded to be consist with the others. Thus, a high score for any of the three dimensions meant greater obedience, motivation, or social ease.

To assess whether or not students perceived themselves as being more obedient, motivated or at ease socially after their participation in the Wilderness Challenge Project, a paired t-test procedure using SAS was performed on the pre- and posttest scores. If there were missing data on any scale the data for that case were ignored.

The results from the procedure are shown below and indicate that, unlike their teachers, students did not perceive themselves as gaining in obedience, motivation, or social ease during their year of participation in Project Wilderness. Pretest and posttest means were not significantly different for any variable. There are two factors which indicate a need to interpret these results with caution. First, there were some answers to open-ended questions which suggest that students were not completely understanding what was being asked of them. Second, instructors indicated on some surveys that the student was being uncooperative that day, and thus, those answers may reflect a transient mood rather than a stable response. This suggests that a more objective measurement of the impact of Project Wilderness on student behavior is needed. Particularly if the program continues to serve emotionally disturbed children, a student self-rating approach will yield questionable results.

Variable	N	Mean	Mean Gain	SE	T	P
Obedience						
Pre	11	31.3	-4.0	1.9	-2.07	.066
Post	11	27.3				
Motivation						
Pre	11	26.3	-2.2	1.2	-1.75	.11
Post	11	24.1				
Social Ease						
Pre	13	13.9	0.7	1.2	0.58	.57
Post	13	14.6				

Figure D-1: T-TEST COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POSTTEST STUDENT SELF-RATINGS OF MOTIVATION, OBEDIENCE, AND SOCIAL EASE

84.63

At the time of the posttesting, a second sheet was attached to the student questionnaire. This sheet asked participants in Project Wilderness to evaluate whether and how the program had helped them. The six questions and a summary of the students' responses are given below.

1. Has participating in the Wilderness Challenge program helped you in any way at school?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	11	58%
No	8	42%

Students reported that the program gave them experience in the world, helped them learn to control their temper, gave them confidence and courage, and taught them to follow directions and to work with others.

2. Have you made any new friends in Wilderness Challenge? If yes, how has making new friends helped you in school?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	10	53%
No	7	37%
No Answer	2	10%

Students felt that Wilderness Challenge had taught them to be a better person and to help others.

3. Did being in the Wilderness Challenge program help you improve your relationship with a teacher or teachers?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	8	42%
No	11	58%

4. What did you do or learn in Wilderness Challenge that helped you the most?

Responses to this question included gaining courage and trust, learning to work with others, as well as trying new activities.

5. What did you like least about Wilderness Challenge?

While most students stated that they disliked nothing, others disliked particular individuals in the group or particular activities.

6. Would you recommend to your friends that they participate in Wilderness Challenge?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	12	63%
No	7	37%

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

Project Wilderness

Student Name:_____

In order to help us understand the Wilderness Challenge Project better, we would like to know more about you. Please tell us something about yourselves by answering the following questions. After you finish, place the questionnaire in the envelope provided, seal the envelope, and give it to your instructor. She will give the envelopes to us at the Office of Research and Evaluation. No one at your school will see your responses. It's important that you answer these questions honestly.

We are interested in how often you do the 16 things listed below. For each of the 16 behaviors listed, please circle a number listed to the right (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Some of the time, 4=Often, 5=Very often) that best describes how often you do each.

	Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	Very Often
1. I follow directions in class.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I make trouble in class.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I come to class on time.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I am polite to teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I disagree with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I fight with other students in class.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I obey classroom or school rules.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I volunteer answers in class.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I bother students when they are working.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I ask questions in class.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I pay attention in class.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I study well for tests.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I do my homework on time.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I give up on hard assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I stick to my homework until it's finished.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I goof off during tests.	1	2	3	4	5

Next, we would like to know how easy it is for you to do the following six things. Circle the number (1, 2, 3, or 4) by the phrase in each sentence that best describes you.

1. It is 1 very easy
   2 somewhat easy
   3 somewhat hard
   4 very hard
   for me to start conversations with students I don't know.

2. It is 1 very easy
   2 somewhat easy
   3 somewhat hard
   4 very hard
   for me to ask teachers for help.

3. It is 1 very easy
   2 somewhat easy
   3 somewhat hard
   4 very hard
   for me to take part in class discussions.

4. It is 1 very easy
   2 somewhat easy
   3 somewhat hard
   4 very hard
   for me to talk to teachers at the school.

5. It is 1 very easy
   2 somewhat easy
   3 somewhat hard
   4 very hard
   for me to make friends at school.

6. It is 1 very easy
   2 somewhat easy
   3 somewhat hard
   4 very hard
   for me to find someone to talk to when I have a problem.

7. It is 1 very easy
   2 somewhat easy
   3 somewhat hard
   4 very hard
   for me to talk over misunderstandings I have with other students.

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEWS WITH PROJECT PLUS
TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

INTERVIEWS WITH PLUS TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Purpose

Interviews with PLUS teachers and principals were conducted to address the following decision and evaluation questions.

Decision Question D5: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Project PLUS (Progress and Learning for Underachieving Students) be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?

Evaluation Question D5-1: How was the PLUS program implemented at the two pilot schools in terms of personnel, student selection, student characteristics, structure, curriculum, and instructional process?

Evaluation Question D5-5: What were the perceived successes, failures, or problems with the project?

Procedure

The evaluation associate held interviews during May, 1985 with the PLUS teacher and principal at each of the two project schools.

Results

The questions asked of the PLUS teachers and principals and a summary of their answers are presented below.

WHAT WERE THE GOALS OF THE PLUS PROGRAM?

Both the Govalle and Sunset Valley principals viewed the primary goal of the PLUS Program as being to assist high risk first graders to achieve and experience success. A related goal was to improve the self-concept of those students and their attitudes toward learning and school. The teacher at Govalle emphasized the small-group help given to the students while the teacher at Sunset Valley sought to provide the basics to children who had not mastered them in Kindergarten.

HOW WERE THE STUDENTS SELECTED FOR PLUS?

Both Govalle and Sunset Valley based their selection of candidates for Project PLUS on spring ITBS scores, performance on the Metropolitan Readiness Test, and teacher assessments and recommendations.

84.63

HOW WAS THE PROGRAM IMPLEMENTED?

Children in both schools were taught in a regular classroom but worked in small groups each day with the PLUS teacher. At Govalle each child spent 2 1/2 hours with the PLUS teacher, one hour on math and the remainder on reading. Group size ranged from four to ten. PLUS students at Sunset Valley worked with the PLUS teacher one hour a day, thirty minutes on math and thirty on reading. Three to six children were grouped together but received individual attention as needed. The children in the PLUS program at both schools were dispersed throughout the first grade classes.

HOW LONG WERE THE STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM?

Principals and teachers at both Govalle and Sunset Valley reported that PLUS students remained in the program for the full school year. If the teacher felt that a child had made considerable progress he/she sometimes kept the child in the regular classroom for reading, math, or both.

IN WHAT WAYS WAS THE PLUS PROGRAM SUCCESSFUL?

The teachers interviewed emphasized both the self-concept and academic progress made by PLUS students. They reported that the individual attention and recognition gave the students a feeling of being special, and the growth and change that occurred helped to improve their self-confidence. The teacher at Govalle felt that those children going on to the second grade would not have done so without the PLUS program.

The principal at Sunset Valley also cited both academic progress and improved self-concept. The Govalle principal stated that PLUS students received the concentrated instruction they needed in both math and reading. In addition, the PLUS program eased the load of the classroom teacher who had an average class size of 21.

WHAT CONCERNS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THE PROGRAM?

All of those interviewed reported that scheduling was a problem. Teachers preferred that students not miss their regular math or reading classes by going to the PLUS class. The Govalle teacher felt that taking the children out of the classroom was sometimes disruptive. The Sunset Valley teacher stated that their PLUS program was held up three weeks while they waited for MRT scores.

One of the Govalle principal's major concerns was whether the program could continue and expand. Only a small percentage of the students needing the program are currently being served. Another problem was that parents were sometimes confused about why their child was selected for Project PLUS.

84.63

WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR IMPROVING PROJECT PLUS?

The teacher at Sunset Valley suggested that more structured quidelines, a curriculum guide, and more meetings with classroom teachers would improve the program. She also would prefer more time for one-on-one instruction. The Govalle teacher felt that a full-time program would better accomplish the goals and suggested that a university student aide be utilized.

The Govalle principal thought that the confusion problem for parents could be solved by involving the Kindergarten teacher in identification and selection of PLUS students. The Sunset Valley principal requested that the program be expanded and that an attempt be made to solve the time constraint problem. Other suggestions were to pool the students into two or three classes and to include some high achieving students for their influence.

Discussion

The dichotomy recognized in the 1983-84 report on Project PLUS between the approaches of the two school seems to have diminished. Neither school concentrated solely on either readiness or reading skills but rather, provided both. The change in retention rates reflects this convergence of approaches. For the 1983-84 school year, 12 out of 20 PLUS students were retained at Sunset Valley, while only 3 out of 16 were not promoted to second grade at Govalle. In the 1984-85 school year, there was not this large difference. Eleven out of nineteen at Sunset Valley and nine out of seventeen at Govalle were retained in first grade.

84.63

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX G

PROJECT PLUS TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

PROJECT PLUS TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose

Responses to a Teacher Questionnaire were used to address the following decision and evaluation questions.

Decision Question D5: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Project PLUS (Progress and Learning for Underachieving Students) be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?

Evaluation Question D5-3: How did the first grade teachers of PLUS students rate their progress at the end of the year?

Evaluation Question D5-4: What percentage of PLUS students are to be retained in first grade for the 1985-86 school year?

Procedure

At the end of April, 1985, first grade teachers were sent evaluation forms (Attachment G-1) and a memo explaining the form (Attachment G-2). They were asked to complete one form for each child in their class who participated in PLUS. For the thirty-seven children who received PLUS services, teachers responded at a rate of 86% by returning 32 questionnaires. Since all questionnaires were not returned, interviews were used to determine the number of children who were retained.

Results

Responses to each objective question on the survey are shown below. Teacher comments on the open-ended question "What could be done to improve Project PLUS?" are listed in Attachment G-3.

1. What basal reader was this child in at the beginning of the year?

	Readiness	PrePrimer 1	PrePrimer 2	PrePrimer 3	Primer
#	31	0	0	0	0
%	97%	0%	0%	0%	0%

(missing data=1, 3%)

2. What basal reader was this child in at the end of the school year?

	Readiness	PrePrimer 1	PrePrimer 2	PrePrimer 3	Primer
#	2	3	5	20	1
%	6%	10%	16%	63%	3%

(missing data=1, 3%)

3. Did attendance improve?

	No	Yes
#	6	26
%	19%	81%

4. Is this child being retained in first grade next year?

	No	Yes
#	14	18
%	44%	56%

FIGURE G-1: RESULTS OF PROJECT PLUS TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE.

Discussion

All of the children whose teachers returned surveys began the year with the Readiness basal reader. Only two children remained at that level. By the end of the 1984-85 school year three children had moved on to the PrePrimer 1 and five to the PrePrimer 2. Most children had progressed even farther to a PrePrimer 3 (20 children) or a Primer (one child).

Another improvement reported by teachers was in attendance. They indicated that the attendance of 26 children, or 81.3%, improved while those students participated in PLUS.

84.63

The survey results show 18 of the 32 children being retained in the first grade. A complete count, however, was obtained during the PLUS Teacher/Principal Interviews. The results are as follows:

School	# Retained	# Not Retained
Govalle	9	8
Sunset Valley	11	8
Totals	20	16

FIGURE G-2: PLUS STUDENTS RETAINED.

Although almost half (44%) of the PLUS students were retained in the first grade, it is not known whether this number would have been higher without the program. Teachers reported that PLUS helped students to progress faster and farther. In addition, other benefits, such as an improved self-image, were cited.

Recommendations for improvement of the PLUS Program were related to scheduling, structure, and communication. One teacher felt that time spent in PLUS should be scheduled according to the child's needs. There were several suggestions that the structure of the program be changed to an all-day program or a self-contained class. Finally, a request was made for closer communication between the PLUS and homeroom teachers.

Attachment G-1

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Department of Management Information
Office of Research and Evaluation

Project PLUS Teacher Evaluation Form

School: _____ Teacher _____

As part of the evaluation of **Project PLUS**, we would like the first grade teachers who have students participating in **Project PLUS** to evaluate their progress this year. Thus, we would appreciate your help in answering the questions below regarding your student _____.

1. What basal reader was this child in at the beginning of the year? (circle one)

   Readiness PrePrimer1 PrePrimer2 PrePrimer3 Primer

2. What basal reader was this child in at the end of the school year? (Circle one.)

   Readiness PrePrimer1 PrePrimer2 PrePrimer3 Primer

3. Did attendance improve? _____Yes _____No

4. Is this child being retained in first grade next year? _____Yes _____No

5. What could be done to improve PROJECT PLUS?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank-you for your help.

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM TO:
DOUGLAS M. BUTLER, BOX 79, CARRUTH ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

84.63

Attachment G-2

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Department of Management Information
Office of Research and Evaluation

May 10, 1985

TO: Teachers of **PROJECT PLUS** Students

FROM: Douglas M. Butler, Evaluation Associate

Subject: PROJECT PLUS Evaluation Forms

We realize that this is a busy time of the school year. However, we feel that your opinions are invaluable, and that you would appreciate the opportunity to be a part of this program's evaluation.

As part of the evaluation of the Chapter 2 Project PLUS program, we had planned to have the regular teachers of Project PLUS students rate the students' progress at the end of the school year. Attached are the evaluation forms for the PLUS students in your class. There is one for each student. Question 6 need only be answered once if you have more than one form to complete. Please return the forms via school mail to me, Office of Research and Evaluation, Carruth Administration Building, Box 79, by May 16, 1985.

We appreciate your help in evaluating this program.

cc: Timy Baranoff
Betty Sanders
Verginia Stevens
Ann Cunningham

Approved: _____
Director
Department of Management Information

Approved: Ruth MacAllister
Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education

RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS ON PROJECT PLUS TEACHER EVALUATIONS

WHAT COULD BE DONE TO IMPROVE PROJECT PLUS?

- Nothing--very pleased with program
- I think the program is run nicely!
- The current format is fine
- I feel that Project PLUS (in its current form) is very beneficial to children
- The program is fine as it is. It has really helped my children
- This program was very helpful in helping L. with reading and math skills
- I was pleased with the program. It helped reinforce reading skills, and it helped pupils develop a more positive self-image
- Take children for classes when it is best for the child and group--not when they have math and reading
- Be careful when hiring teachers to teach the program. Show learners need special care and understanding
- The teacher who is now teaching the PLUS program is very caring and understanding. If all of the schools had a teacher like this, little would need to be improved if anything .
- More class time in PLUS
- Closer communication with homeroom teacher
- Self-contained class of children, for example, a K-1st transition class
- All day class with small teacher-student ratio
- I see Project PLUS as a necessary program which has helped my high-risk students. They were given a chance to learn in an ideal environment. I would like to see Project PLUS be more structured in terms of goal-oriented/skill mastered approach with teacher and aide personnel
- The program is helpful for the students and teacher. I believe, however, that the homeroom teacher needs to "double-dose" her children in reading as well as the PLUS teacher

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX H

PROJECT PLUS PARENT SURVEY

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

PROJECT PLUS PARENT SURVEY

Purpose

A survey of parents of Project PLUS students was conducted to obtain information relevant to the following decision and evaluation questions.

Decision Question D5: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Project PLUS (Progress and Learning for Underachieving Students) be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?

Evaluation Question D5-5: What were the perceived successes, failures, or problems with the project?

Procedure

At the end of April, 1985, parents whose children had participated in Project PLUS were sent a survey form (Attachment H-1) and were asked to return it to the first grade teacher. For the thirty-seven children receiving PLUS services, twenty parent surveys were returned, for a return rate of 54%.

Results

The parent survey consisted of only six items, four objective questions followed by two open-ended questions. Responses to the objective questions are shown below. Parents' answers to the open-ended questions are listed in Attachment H-2.

---

1. Project PLUS helped my child to have extra help with math and reading.

	#	%
Yes	20	100
No	0	0
Don't Know/No Opinion	0	0

2. If your child had not been given extra help in math and reading, would he/she have made progress?

	#	%
Yes	5	25%
No	10	50%
Don't Know/No Opinion	4	20%
Missing data	1	5%

84.63

3. How much time per week do you spend helping your child with his/her homework?

	#	%
0-1 hour per week	6	30
2-3 hours per week	10	50
4-5 hours per week	2	10
6 or more hours per week	2	10

4. How often are your able to visit your child's teacher?

	#	%
0-2 times per year	11	55
3 or more times per year	7	35
missing data	2	10

FIGURE H-1: RESULTS OF PROJECT PLUS PARENT SURVEY.

Discussion

All of the parents surveyed stated that Project PLUS provided their child with extra help in math and reading, and exactly one-half felt that their child would not have made progress without this help. Responses to the open-ended questions indicate that parents have noted improvements in both reading and math skills and increases in confidence and motivation.

A majority of parents reported that they spent two to three hours a week helping their child with homework. However, some parents may have been reluctant to check 0 to 2 hours feeling that they might be judged as giving no help. Most parents (55%) answered that they visit their child's teacher 0-2 times per year.

PARENT SURVEY

This year your child was chosen to receive extra help in math and reading. Please help us evaluate the usefulness of that help by completing this form.

School Name: _____

1. It helped my child to have extra help with math and reading — (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE) YES NO DON'T KNOW / NO OPINION

2. If your child had not been given extra help in math and reading, would she/he have made progress. — (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE) YES NO DON'T KNOW / NO OPINION

3. How much time per week do you spend helping your child with his/her home-work?
(PLEASE PUT A CHECK ( ) ON ONLY ONE LINE)

_____ 0 to 1 hour per week

_____ 2 to 3 hours per week

_____ 4 to 5 hours per week

_____ 6 or more hours per week

4. How often are you able to visit your child's teacher?
(PLEASE PUT A CHECK ( ) ON ONLY ONE LINE)

_____ 0 to 2 times per year

_____ 3 or more times per year

5. How has the program been helpful? _____

_____

_____

6. How could the program be improved? _____

_____

_____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM TO YOUR CHILD'S FIRST GRADE TEACHER

RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS ON PROJECT PLUS PARENT SURVEY

HOW HAS THE PROGRAM BEEN HELPFUL?

- I feel the program was very helpful and should be provided for all that need it. Very beneficial.
- Confidence has really grown since he has been receiving the extra help in math and reading.
- She is doing better and I am very happy for her, so please keep on working with her.
- He is learning and spending more time studying.
- Yes, rainbow cards are helpful.
- Just fine.
- By giving each child the time to learn more.
- It has helped my child improve in reading and math. I appreciate all the help of the teachers. If it weren't for the books they sent home for mothers to help their children read, I don't think children would be interested in reading.
- He has learned to read, and he is also learning his math.
- I work at night and haven't been able to spend much time to help, so I think it was very helpful in many ways.

HOW COULD THE PROGRAM BE IMPROVED?

- Only the teacher would have those suggestions. I have never met a teacher with such warmth and concern for such a frustrating age group. Again, thanks.
- By sending work home with the child so that she can be helped more and I will work with her to help her pass to the next grade.
- The program could not be improved more than it has been. I really enjoy having my child in the program.
- Keep up the good work and thank you all for helping.
- Because she can read and do her math, she has improved.
- By letting him know how important it is to make a good record in his grades for the following year.
- Start at 2:45.
- Does not need any improvement.
- By helping her with her work.

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX I

SPANISH ACADEMY ATTENDANCE LOG AND JOB TITLES

84.63

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

SPANISH ACADEMY: ATTENDANCE LOG AND JOB TITLES

Purpose

Attendance sheets were kept by the four Spanish instructors and job titles were requested in order to obtain information relevant to the following decision and evaluation questions:

> Decision Question D6: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Spanish Academy Program be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?
>
> > Evaluation Question D6-1: Who attended the classes and how well were the classes attended?

Procedure

The Spanish instructors were given attendance sheets prior to the start of each semester and were asked to record attendance. Their forms were returned to the evaluation associate at the end of April, 1985. In addition, course evaluations completed by participants in the Spanish Academy included information on job titles.

Results

There were four Spanish teachers for 14 classes for both the fall and spring semesters. In the fall, two teachers taught four classes each while the other two had only three, as one of those was a beginner class meeting twice a week. Three teachers taught four classes each in the spring, while one taught only two. In the fall, eight of the classes met from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m., four were held between 5:00 and 7:00 p.m., and two met from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. The schedule in the spring was more varied, with only 6 classes meeting from 6:00 to 8:00, four from 5:00 to 7:00, and two from 5:30 to 7:30. The remaining two met earlier, from 3:30 to 5:30 and 4:00 to 6:00. The class duration was 12 weeks in the fall and 14 weeks in the spring.

Class Size

The average class size for each of the four teachers is shown below. Persons who attended fewer than four sessions were considered dropouts and were not included in this count.

	Teacher 1	2	3	4
Average class size:	10.3	8.8	8.0	9.8

Average for all teachers: 9.2

This overall average for class size is smaller than last year's 12.6.

84.63

Attendance

The average class attendance was determined for each teacher and a percentage found by dividing attendance by class size. The results are shown below.

	Teacher 1	2	3	4
Average class attendance:	7.7 (75%)	6.6 (75%)	6.0 (75%)	6.9 (71%)

Average for all teachers: 6.8 (74%)

Job Titles of Participants

Of the 261 staff members registered for Spanish Academy classes, 189 included their job titles on the course evaluation form. A breakdown of those job titles is shown below.

Job Title	Number Taking Course
Teacher, teacher aide	120
Secretary	8
Administrator	6
School Psychologist	2
Speech/Language Pathologist	5
Vision/Hearing Technician	1
Project Specialist	2
Coordinator of Elementary School Libraries	1
Librarian	14
Counselor	4
School Nurse	4
Teacher Coordinator	1
Clerk, Accounting Clerk	9
Energy Coordinator	1
Food Service Worker	3
Bus Driver, Scheduler	3
Occupational Therapist	1
Evaluation Associate	1
Reading Specialist	1
Wilderness Challenge Project Assistant	1
Personnel	1
TOTALS	189

Compared with last year's enrollment there were almost twice the number of teachers in the 1984-85 classes. Again, there was a wide diversity in jobs represented; many were the same, but many were different from the previous year.

84.63

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX J

SPANISH ACADEMY COURSE EVALUATION

84.63

CHAPTER 2--DISCRETIONARY COURSE EVALUATION

SPANISH ACADEMY

Purpose

Course evaluations were completed by the participants in the Spanish Academy to provide answers to the following decision and evaluation questions:

Decision Question D6: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Spanish Academy Program be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?

Evaluation Question D6-2: What did participants hope to gain from the course and how satisfied were they with the instruction and instructor?

Procedure

In January, the fall class rosters were used to mail course evaluations (Attachment J-1) to fall semester participants. For the spring semester, the course evaluations were given to the Spanish instructors who administered them to their classes during the week of April 22, 1985. The data was coded and keypunched by the Office of Research and Evaluation. A frequency analysis using SPSS was then run on the data.

Results

The breakdown of the responses to each question on the course evaluation is given below.

A. Course Content

1. The organization of the course was:

Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
0(0%)	1(1%)	12(6%)	59(30%)	125(63%)

Compared with the previous year's finding, more participants rated the organization of the course as "excellent" rather than simply "good".

2. The pace of the course was:

Too Slow	Slow	Just Right	Fast	Too Fast
1(1%)	8(4%)	152(76%)	34(17%)	2(1%)

The number of respondents indicating that the pace of the course was "fast" increased slightly from the 1983-84 survey.

3. The amount of time allowed for oral work was:

Too little	Just Right	Too Much
17(9%)	177(89%)	3(2%)

4. The amount of time allowed for cultural instruction was:

Too Little	Just Right	Too Much
4(2%)	177(89%)	14(7%)

(missing data=5,3%)

While approximately the same percentage of participants felt that the amount of time allowed for cultural instruction was just right for this year's class and the previous one, more felt that too much time was allowed this year.

Check one response:	Yes	No
5. Textbooks were helpful (missing data=4,2%)	169(85%)	27(14%)
6. Handouts were helpful (missing data=2,1%)	198(99%)	0(0%)
7. Cultural Consultants (missing data=11,6%)	179(90%)	10(5%)
8 Audiovisual materials (missing data=10,5%)	176(88%)	14(7%)

This question was somewhat different in the previous year's study as no textbooks were used. Respondents were asked whether they would have preferred a textbook to the xeroxed materials and 40% indicated that they would. This year 85% felt that the textbook was helpful.

B. Scheduling

Were you satisfied with each of the following aspects of scheduling?

	Yes	No
1. Frequency of classes (missing data=1%)	189(95%)	10(5%)

The percentage of those satisfied with the frequency of classes rose by 10% when compared with the previous year. Only four respondents indicated an alternative to the frequency with which the class met. They suggested that the class meet twice a week for two hour sessions.

	Yes	No
2. Location of classes (Missing data=2,1%)	189(95%)	9(5%)

The comments concerned having the classes closer to their homes.

	Yes	No
3. Time of classes (Missing data=1,1%)	176(88%)	23(12%)

The percentages of participants satisfied with scheduling increased slightly over the previous year, perhaps reflective of the greater variety of times classes were offered.

	Yes	No
4. Size of classes (Missing data=0)	198(99%)	2(1%)

The numbers satified with size of class also went up this year, perhaps because average class size was smaller.

5. Duration of Course	Yes	No
(Missing data=3,2%)	188(94%)	9(5%)

The percentage of respondents satisfied with the duration of the class was larger by 12% than the previous year. This year classes met for 12 or 14 weeks, while last year they were held either 8, 15, or 16 weeks.

C. General

1. Why did you sign up for this course? The majority of respondents signed up to improve their Spanish with many commenting that they needed to be able to communicate with Spanish-speaking parents and students.

2. Has the course helped you in general?	Yes	No
(Missing data=2,1%)	191(96%)	7(4%)

3. Has the course helped you in your job?	Yes	No
(Missing data=11,6%)	151(76%)	38(19%)

Responses to this question can be found in Attachment J-2. Most participants felt that the course gave them the ability and confidence to try to communicate with their Spanish-speaking students and parents and that this effort was appreciated.

4. Were you enrolled in the Spanish Academy before?	Yes	No
(Missing data=1,1%)	90(45%)	109(55%)

5. If Yes, when?
Of those who had attended the Spanish Academy before only three had participated in every semester thus far. The majority of those enrolled this spring (1985) had attended either spring or fall of 1984.

6. Do you plan to continue taking Spanish Academy classes?	Yes	No
(Missing data=10,5%)	158(79%)	32(16%)

The percentage of respondents who decided to continue taking Spanish Academy classes decreased from 96% in 1983-84 to 83% in 1984-85. However, responses to previous questions seem to rule out any significant dissatisfaction with the program. Of those who indicated that they would not continue taking Spanish Academy classes the major concern was fitting Spanish Academy classes into an already busy schedule. Others indicated they were moving out of the city, retiring or simply not sure.

Space was also provided for participants to make additional comments.

In general, the classes were thought to be well organized and well taught. Praise was extended to Austin Independent School District for providing such an opportunity for its staff.

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

Job Title of Participant:_____

In order to improve the Spanish Academy classes, we need some input from you, the participants. We would appreciate it if you would complete the following questionnaire.

A. Course content
Please circle the appropriate response.

1. The organization of the course was:

   Very Poor Poor Adequate Good Excellent

2. The pace of the course was:

   Too slow Slow Just Right Fast Too Fast

3. The amount of time allowed for oral work was:

   Too little Just right Too much

4. The amount of time allowed for cultural instruction was:

   Too little Just right Too much

5. Were course materials helpful? Check "Yes" or "No" for each item. If you were not satisfied, please comment.

1. _____Yes_____No	Textbook	_____
2. _____Yes_____No	Handouts	_____
3. _____Yes_____No	Cultural Consultants	_____
4. _____Yes_____No	Audiovisual materials	_____

B. Scheduling
Were you satisfied with each of the following aspects of scheduling? Check "Yes" or "No" for each item. If you respond with a "No," indicate in the blank space what you would have preferred.

1. _____Yes_____No	Frequency of classes	_____
2. _____Yes_____No	Location of classes	_____
3. _____Yes_____No	Time of classes	_____
4. _____Yes_____No	Size of classes	_____
5. _____Yes_____No	Duration of course	_____

Comments_____

_____

RETURN TO: Douglas Wheeler
U.R.E. BOX 79
ADMINISTRATION BLDG.

C. General

1. Why did you sign up for this course?_____

_____

2. Has the course helped you in general? _____Yes_____No
   Has the course helped you in your job? _____Yes_____No

3. If Yes, please explain:_____

_____

_____

4. Were you enrolled in the Spanish Academy before? _____Yes_____No
5. If Yes, when_____
6. Do you plan to continue taking Spanish Academy Classes? _____Yes_____No

   If No, why not ? _____

_____

_____

(See Section D for comments on reverse)

RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS ON
SPANISH ACADEMY COURSE EVALUATION

HAS THE COURSE HELPED YOU IN YOUR JOB? IF YES, PLEASE EXPLAIN.

- I try to use Spanish in dealing with building operations staff where we have problems. I believe it will help me and them.
- Many of my students are Hispanic and some parents speak little or no English. The class helps.
- It has helped me with my pronunciation of Spanish, my confidence in speaking Spanish words and/or phrases, and my understanding of verbs.
- I'm certifying for Bilingual Education; this course was a tremendous help and I'm grateful.
- I became more familiar with school terminology in Spanish.
- Not yet, but it will next fall when I'll be in a predominantly Hispanic school.
- I have learned more about the culture of Mexico.
- I use it in teaching and general communication with my kids.
- Some. If I had been able to continue I believe I would have benefitted.
- My students help me review my Spanish. They think it's terrific, and I'm terrific.
- I'm speaking a little Spanish now with my monolingual students.
- Not at this time directly. I was already aware of Spanish culture to some extent. However, the course has enabled me to expand my knowledge.
- I have learned language and culture. I hope to teach in a school with Spanish-speaking children.
- I am the LEP coordinator at my school. I am now able to give the Spanish LAB test myself.
- It has helped me a lot to hear the speakers from different countries talk. Also, I've had the opportunity that I otherwise would not have had to discuss topics that interest me in Spanish.
- I teach reading and ESL. Learning Spanish and learning to read it aloud has given me much more empathy for my students than I've had before.

- Relating to Bilingual staff helps me to learn more about the language, pronunciation, etc.

- As a librarian, I deal with Spanish material.

- I really want to learn Spanish and wish I had more time to study.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, IF ANY

- I was very pleased with the teaching methods. The teacher made the class interesting, challenging, and fun.

- Thank you for everything.

- I really enjoyed the cultural aspect of the class. It was interesting and educational. My instructor was also interesting and showed enthusiasm. It was fun!

- I really enjoyed the class, and J. was an excellent teacher.

- I have enjoyed S's class very much. She has a way of putting you at ease and making learning fun. I look forward to the summer session.

- I am really pleased that such a program is offered. It was great!

- S.'s class was a real pleasure. She was creative in her efforts to use very interesting class material. I enjoyed her teaching style very much.

- I have been very impressed with the teaching skills and organization of our teacher. She has made this course a pleasurable experience.

- Very good class--interesting topics for discussion--used Spanish more than in any other class.

- The teacher is a great instructor and has tried to allow for everyone's capabilities, but due to the time span of the course a lot of basics had to be covered rapidly. A class designed to be a little slower and at a lower level would be beneficial for classroom aides and bus drivers who must come in contact with Spanish-speaking students as well as adults.

- I like the low-keyed presentation of the course; it helps to build confidence and is encouraging me to continue.

- Excellent teacher--energetic and patient.

- The teaching staff and the program are outstanding. I certainly do wish to see this program continue and if possible expanded.

- I would like to see audio tapes used between classes to reinforce the classroom sessions. Lack of use of the language is the biggest barrier to learning. The instructor could record all of the lessons and make copies of the tapes available to students. Use the format: Hear-Repeat-Listen.

84.63

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

APPENDIX K

PROJECT ACHIEVE

ADMINISTRATOR/TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY

PROJECT ACHIEVE

ADMINISTRATOR/TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose

A districtwide survey of administrators and teachers was conducted this year by the Office of Research and Evaluation. It included one question of administrators and four of teachers which addressed the following decision and evaluation questions.

Decision Question D2: Should the Chapter 2 Discretionary Project Achieve be continued, expanded, or revised? If so, how?

Evaluation Question D2-4: How did the English teachers and principals rate the services provided by Project Achieve.

Procedure

Questions related to Project Achieve were included in the districtwide survey of administrators and teachers (Attachment K-1). This survey is conducted annually by the Office of Research and Evaluation to gather information on issues of districtwide importance. For details on the sampling procedures, instrument description, and survey distribution, see the Systemwide Evaluation 1984-85 Technical Report, Vol. II, ORE Publication No. 84.20.

Results

Item 1 of the districtwide survey of administrators asked administrators in junior high schools to indicate their degree of "agreement" with the statement, "The services provided by the Project Achieve staff were adequate." Twenty-four out of the twenty-six sampled responded to this question. The results are shown below:

1. "The services provided by the Project Achieve staff were adequate."

	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	1	4.2%
Agree	10	41.7%
Neutral	2	8.3%
Disagree	3	12.5%
Strongly Disagree	2	8.3%
Don't know/not applicable	6	25.0%

Figure K-1. RESULTS OF DISTRICTWIDE ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY.

84.63

The results of this survey indicate that while a large number of administrators agree that Project Achieve services were adequate, 25% either don't know or feel that the question is not applicable. Since the program was available in all secondary schools, the problem may stem from a lack of visibilty or knowledge of the service being provided.

Four questions from the districtwide survey asked both junior high and high school teachers to evaluate Project Achieve. Out of a sample of 703 teachers, 459 responded to the questions. The questions and responses are shown below:

---

7. "Project Achieve reading staff provided effective inservice training (informal and formal) for content area teachers for the purpose of helping to raise reading test scores of students."

Number Responding	Junior High n=140	High School n=310	Totals n=458
Strongly Agree	8 (5.7%)	11 (3.5%)	21 (4.6%)
Agree	34 (24.3%)	43 (13.9%)	79 (17.2%)
Neutral	15 (10.7%)	41 (13.2%)	56 (12.2%)
Disagree	17 (12.1%)	17 (5.5%)	34 (7.4%)
Strongly Disagree	9 (6.4%)	14 (4.5%)	23 (5.0%)
Don't Know/ Not Applicable	57 (40.7%)	184 (59.4%)	245 (53.5%)

8. "Project Achieve Reading Specialists provided effective mini-sessions in TABS skills."

Number Responding	Junior High n=148	High School n=311	Totals n=459
Strongly Agree	26 (5.7%)	16 (5.1%)	26 (5.7%)
Agree	64 (13.9%)	36 (11.6%)	64 (13.9%)
Neutral	59 (12.9%)	38 (12.2%)	59 (12.9%)
Disagree	28 (6.1%)	17 (5.5%)	28 (6.1%)
Strongly Disagree	28 (6.1%)	16 (5.1%)	28 (6.1%)
Don't Know/Not Applicable	254 (55.3%)	188 (60.5%)	254 (55.3%)

84.63

9. "Project Achieve reading staff effectively recommended strategies for including TABS skills in the content areas."

Number Responding	Junior High n=140	High School n=311	Totals n=459
Strongly Agree	10 (7.1%)	12 (3.9%)	24 (5.2%)
Agree	28 (20.0%)	51 (16.4%)	81 (17.6%)
Neutral	19 (13.6%)	38 (12.2%)	57 (12.4%)
Disagree	13 (9.3%)	16 (5.1%)	29 (6.3%)
Strongly Disagree	9 (6.4%)	12 (3.9%)	21 (4.6%)
Don't Know/Not Applicable	61 (43.6%)	182 (58.5%)	247 (53.8%)

10. "The services provided by the Project Achieve staff were adequate."

Number Responding	Junior High n=140	High School n=310	Totals n=458
Strongly Agree	9 (6.4%)	12 (3.9%)	23 (5.0%)
Agree	36 (25.7%)	45 (14.5%)	82 (17.9%)
Neutral	15 (10.7%)	40 (12.9%)	56 (12.2%)
Disagree	15 (10.7%)	16 (5.2%)	31 (6.8%)
Strongly Disagree	9 (6.4%)	17 (5.5%)	26 (5.7%)
Don't Know/Not Applicable	56 (40%)	180 (58.1%)	240 (52.4%)

Figure K2: RESULTS OF DISTRICTWIDE SURVEY OF TEACHERS.

The number of teachers responding with a "don't know/not applicable" answer was even more dramatic than the number of administrators responding this way. Junior High teachers seem to be more aware of the program than High School teachers. There are two possible explanations for these results. Either the Project Achieve has not been active in many classrooms, or it has simply not been visible. Since more administrators than teachers were aware of the program, the former possibility is probably not likely. Rather, many teachers may have received Project Achieve services without knowing the source of those services.

Attachment K-1

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL SURVEY QUESTIONS
PROJECT ACHIEVE

A = Strongly Agree
B = Agree
C = Neutral
D = Disagree
E = Strongly Disagree
F = Don't Know

Teachers: 1. The staff developments for Project Achieve were helpful.

Teachers: 2. Project Achieve Reading Specialists provided effective mini-sessions in TABS skills.

Teachers: 3. Project Achieve Reading Specialists effectively assisted in the assessment of reading level materials.

Teachers & Principals: 4. The services provided by the Project Achieve staff were adequate.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Larry G. Waterhouse, President

Abel R. Ruiz, Vice President

Bernice Hart, Secretary

Lidia M. Pérez

Peter W. Werner, M.D.

Ed Small

Nan Clayton

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. John Ellis

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Dr. Glynn Ligon